## IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA GREENVILLE DIVISION

Benjamin J. Kinard,	)	
Plaintiff,	)	C.A. No. 6:10-cv-00262-JMC
V	)	ORDER
V.	)	ORDER
Kevin Coleman, Linda Bradshaw, and	)	
Mr. Gibson,	)	
Defendants.	)	
	)	

This matter is before the court on Kevin Coleman, Linda Bradshaw, and Mr. Gibson's ("Defendants") Motion for Summary Judgment [Entry # 32]. Benjamin J. Kinard ("Plaintiff"), a state prisoner proceeding *pro se*, seeks relief under Title 42, United States Code, Section 1983. Plaintiff alleges discrimination and deliberate medical indifference against Defendants, employees of the Turbeville Correctional Institution ("TCI"), a facility of the South Carolina Department of Corrections ("SCDC").

The Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation [Entry # 47], filed on October 26, 2010, recommends Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment [Entry # 32] be granted. The Report and Recommendation sets forth in detail the relevant facts and legal standards on this matter, and the court incorporates the Magistrate Judge's recommendation herein without a recitation.

The Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation is made in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) and Local Civil Rule 73.02 for the District of South Carolina. The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to this court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight. The responsibility to make a final determination remains with this court. *See Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261, 270-71 (1976). The court is charged with making a *de novo* determination of those portions of the Report and Recommendation to which specific objections are made, and the court

may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the Magistrate Judge's recommendation or

recommit the matter with instructions. See 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1).

Plaintiff was advised of his right to file objections to the Report and Recommendation [Entry

# 47-1, at 1]. However, Plaintiff filed no objections to the Report and Recommendation.

In the absence of objections to the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation, this

court is not required to provide an explanation for adopting the recommendation. See Camby v.

Davis, 718 F.2d 198, 199 (4th Cir. 1983). Rather, "in the absence of a timely filed objection, a

district court need not conduct a de novo review, but instead must 'only satisfy itself that there is

no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation." Diamond v.

Colonial Life & Acc. Ins. Co., 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005) (quoting Fed. R. Civ. P. 72

advisory committee's note). Furthermore, failure to file specific written objections to the Report and

Recommendation results in a party's waiver of the right to appeal from the judgment of the District

Court based upon such recommendation. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Thomas v. Arn, 474 U.S. 140

(1985); Wright v. Collins, 766 F.2d 841 (4th Cir. 1985); United States v. Schronce, 727 F.2d 91 (4th

Cir. 1984).

After a thorough review of the Report and Recommendation and the record in this case, the

court adopts the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation [Entry # 47] and incorporates it

herein. It is therefore **ORDERED** that Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgement [Entry # 32]

is granted.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/ J. Michelle Childs United States District Judge

Greenville, South Carolina

November 23, 2010

2